

Tax

Issue H74/2017 – 28 March 2017

Tax Analysis

Oops!...They Did It Again Hong Kong's Aircraft Leasing Bill

Author:

Hong Kong

Jonathan Culver

Tax Partner

Tel: +852 2852 6683

Email: joculver@deloitte.com.hk

On 22 March 2017, Inland Revenue (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill 2017, which provides for concessionary tax treatment on aircraft leasing activity, was given its first reading by the Hong Kong Legislative Council. The provisions contained in the bill have been widely anticipated as a means to allow Hong Kong to be a credible aircraft leasing hub. The bill provides for net aircraft leasing income to be taxed at an effective rate of 1.65% (as opposed to the standard rate of 16.5%), with profits from the management of an aircraft leasing activity to be taxed at 8.25%.

However, as with other recent legislative amendments providing specific concessions in areas such as Islamic finance, cash pooling/intra-group financing and the deductibility of interest on regulatory capital securities, the incentives contained in the bill are 1) restricted in their application, 2) lacking in certainty, 3) needlessly complex, and 4) subject to anti-avoidance provisions. While some of the measures in the bill may be strong enough to bring Hong Kong a genuine economic advantage, the bill suffers from similar issues as previous legislative reform efforts and underscores the urgent need for a specialized unit on tax policy, as announced in the 2017-2018 Hong Kong budget.

Selected examples of issues with the current draft of the bill are explained below; however, this is not an exhaustive list.

Overview of the bill

The bill covers the following two types of activities:

- 1) **Aircraft leasing activity:** This relates to the leasing of the aircraft itself, and concessionary taxation is provided for on the leasing income derived. Only 20% of the net leasing income (with no deduction for depreciation) would be taxed, at a concessionary rate of 8.25%, resulting in an effective rate of 1.65%. This concession can be considered the primary inducement for the industry to move aircraft leasing activity to Hong Kong.
- 2) **Aircraft leasing management activity:** This relates to the support services in respect of an aircraft leasing activity, and covers a range of activities, the profits from which would be taxed at the concessional rate of 8.25%. This concession is intended to induce the aircraft leasing support industry to be based in Hong Kong.

It is anticipated that the bill will be passed into law by June 2017, and will apply to sums received or accrued on or after 1 April 2017.

Issues

Definition of "non-Hong Kong aircraft operator"

The provisions of the bill apply where a corporation carrying on a qualifying aircraft leasing activity leases an aircraft to a "non-Hong Kong aircraft operator." The bill is drafted this way because lessors to non-Hong Kong aircraft operators are currently disadvantaged under section 39E of the Inland Revenue Ordinance (CAP. 112) (IRO), which allows capital allowances to be claimed by an owner of aircraft only where the aircraft is leased to an operator of Hong Kong aircraft. The existing definition of "operator of a Hong Kong aircraft" in section 39E requires the holding of an air operators' certificate issued under the Air Navigation (Hong Kong) Order 1995 (Cap. 448 sub. Leg. C), and for the business to be controlled and managed in Hong Kong. However, rather than simply adapting this definition for non-Hong Kong aircraft operators (for example, by suggesting that a non-Hong Kong aircraft operator is one that is managed and controlled outside of Hong Kong and that holds an alternative license), the bill has defined a non-Hong Kong aircraft operator as one "who is not chargeable to profits tax under this Ordinance."

The issue with the above definition is that, under section 23D of the IRO, on the ascertainment of assessable profits of a nonresident aircraft owner (where the Inland Revenue Department (IRD) generally views an operator of aircraft to be an owner), any aircraft operator that lands at an aerodrome or airport within Hong Kong will be deemed to be carrying on a business in Hong Kong and, in principle, will be subject to the charge of Hong Kong profits tax. An exemption from that charge is normally provided under the relevant article of an applicable tax agreement, such as article 8 of the Hong Kong–China tax agreement. However, notwithstanding the exemption, the corporation would still arguably technically be chargeable to profits tax. This would mean that any aircraft operator that lands in Hong Kong would not be considered a non-Hong Kong aircraft operator, and so the provisions of the bill would not apply to a lease of aircraft to that operator. It would seem to be contrary to the intention of the bill for its provisions not to apply to any aircraft operator that lands in Hong Kong. The government should consider changing the IRO in this regard, to provide certainty; however, it appears far more likely that the IRD will seek to address this point by way of example, in non-binding Departmental Interpretation and Practice Notes (DIPN).

Definition of "lease"

The definition of a lease is essential to the operation of the bill, because the bill applies to either an aircraft leasing activity itself or an aircraft leasing management activity. Therefore, it would be preferable for a "lease" to be defined widely to give flexibility to the commercial arrangements into which lessors and lessees could enter. However, this is not the case, and the bill has actually sought to narrow the definition of a lease from that currently included in the IRO.

Hire-purchase agreements and conditional sale agreements currently are excluded from the definition of a lease in section 2 of the IRO, so it would be reasonable to expect them not to be considered leases for the purposes of the bill. However, the bill has gone a step further and sought to exclude finance leases

(referred to by the bill as “funding leases”, but defined on similar terms to finance leases) that have an option to transfer the aircraft, unless, in the opinion of the IRD Commissioner, it would be reasonable to expect that the aircraft would not transfer to the lessee.

This is problematic because:

- 1) It would constrain the commercial terms on which aircraft leases may be entered; and
- 2) If a finance lease contains an option to buy the aircraft, the application of the provisions of the bill would be subject to the discretion of the IRD, which creates subjectivity and uncertainty and ultimately may require an advance ruling to be obtained.

It could be argued that many of the leveraged leasing structures currently used in Hong Kong involve leases structured to qualify for these terms. However, this may be because the majority of existing leveraged leasing activity being carried out in Hong Kong is ruled on by the IRD. To obtain an IRD ruling, the lease terms have to align with the IRD’s views (including those espoused in paragraph 65, part H of DIPN 15 on what constitutes a lease). It is unfortunate, however, that the IRD now appears to have sought to legislate those views through the bill, which is intended to be incentive legislation.

It also is unclear why the definition of a lease would be narrowed in this manner, since lessors and lessees taking advantage of the bill would not be able to benefit from Hong Kong capital allowances in any case, so the same avoidance opportunities that may arise in respect of Hong Kong leveraged leases should not be available under the bill.

It seems that the bill should seek to attract as many aircraft lessors as possible and, while the current definition of “lease” will cater to many lessors, there appears to be no reason that lessors providing finance leases should be excluded. The bill should be flexible to accommodate the commercial arrangements of lessors and should provide certainty through appropriate legislative drafting, rather than through IRD rulings.

Need for the lessor to be Hong Kong tax resident

Given Hong Kong’s favorable tax agreement with China, under which the withholding tax on royalties paid to an aircraft lessor is limited to 5% (and the fact that the onshore aircraft leasing market is less developed than that of other jurisdictions, such as Japan), it is likely that Hong Kong primarily will be seen as a venue to lease aircraft to China. To take advantage of the Hong Kong–China tax agreement, the lessor must be tax resident in Hong Kong. For residence to exist based on the lessor’s management and control, it follows that company directors would have to be hired in Hong Kong, or at least base themselves in Hong Kong during the time they make board decisions, which would benefit Hong Kong’s economy.

However, not all aircraft leasing vehicles are special purpose vehicles (SPVs) holding single aircraft; aircraft lessors that do not require bank financing may be set up with multiple aircraft in a large company. In these cases, requiring the lessor to be tax resident in Hong Kong means that a lessor with substantial substance in Hong Kong, but perhaps with greater substance and tax residency elsewhere, would not be able benefit from the provisions of the bill without creating a new Hong Kong tax resident entity and transferring planes to that entity.

While the bill must seek to provide an economic benefit to Hong Kong, requiring the lessor to be tax resident makes the regime harder to comply with. It also likely is unnecessary, given that the operational activity pertaining to leasing the aircraft must be undertaken from Hong Kong (whether by the lessor or an agent). As an alternative, this requirement could be replaced/supplemented with a minimum Hong Kong spending requirement (as is common in Singapore tax incentives), or a substance requirement.

Treatment of aircraft as a capital asset if leased for a continuous period of three years or more

The bill provides that if an aircraft is continuously leased for a period of three years, it will be considered a

capital asset, such that any gain or loss on the sale would not be taxable or deductible.

Other jurisdictions have similar provisions, although usually in respect of other asset classes, such as shares. For example, tax provisions in the UK and Singapore provide that, where shares are held for a certain period of time and other conditions apply, any gain will be exempt (UK) or considered capital in nature and not subject to tax (Singapore). Such provisions are typically helpful because they provide certainty of the tax treatment of substantial shareholdings and, if a gain is derived (as is usually the expectation when acquiring shares), the provisions are concessional.

However, the nature of aircraft is that they are assets that generally will lose value over time. Accordingly, it is far more likely that any disposal after a three-year period would lead to a loss, which would clearly be non-deductible under the bill, as a result of being capital. However, if the aircraft is sold for a profit within the first three years of ownership, the lessor would still be required to undertake a capital/revenue analysis to determine whether the gain is taxable, leading to uncertainty. The bill would provide more certainty if aircraft were treated as capital assets throughout the entire period of ownership, such that lessors could freely sell aircraft without any concern of triggering a significant tax charge.

If the aircraft is owned by an SPV, in practice, it may be easier for a lessor to simply sell the SPV as a means of transferring ownership of the aircraft. It seems that the bill should have been drafted to provide greater certainty, so that tax planning is not required.

Provisions regarding aircraft leasing management activity

The bill lists various aircraft leasing management activities, which, subject to other conditions, can be undertaken by a qualifying aircraft leasing manager; the profits from such activities would be subject to the 8.25% rate. There are 13 activities in total; however, they do not mesh well with the other provisions of the bill.

For example, schedule 17F, section 1(1)(j) of the bill provides that the marketing of operating leases would be considered an aircraft leasing management activity. First, it is unclear why marketing relating only to operating leases should be considered an aircraft leasing management activity. While, as a commercial reality, many aircraft leases are considered operating leases by market participants, a significant portion are finance leases, and these should not be excluded.

Second, despite the considerable attention given to defining leases, "dry leases" and funding leases in the definitions section of the bill, the term "operating lease" is not defined in the bill, nor is it defined anywhere else in the IRO—while the market will have its view on the definition of an operating lease, it would be helpful if the bill included a definition, to provide certainty.

A further example of drafting issues can be found in schedule 17F, section 1(1)(k) of the bill, which would allow financing to be provided to an airline enterprise for the purchase of an aircraft. At first glance, this is a simple and reasonable provision. However, per section 14G(7) of the bill, an aircraft leasing management activity will be a qualifying activity only if it meets a number of criteria, including that the qualifying aircraft leasing manager must perform the activity for another corporation and that corporation must be a qualifying aircraft lessor. However, a corporation can be a qualifying aircraft lessor only if it is not an aircraft operator. This means that schedule 17F, section 1(1)(k) of the bill can apply only where a corporation provides financing to an airline enterprise, and that airline enterprise is not an aircraft operator. While the bill does not define an "airline enterprise," it seems highly unlikely that a company that is an airline enterprise and requires financing to purchase an aircraft would not also be an aircraft operator.

While the policy objective of including financing extended to purchase aircraft within the provisions of the bill is reasonable, it appears that the current drafting of the bill would not achieve its intended objectives and is overly complicated.

Summary

While the bill appears to be a positive step toward making Hong Kong an aircraft leasing hub, and the incentives should allow a significant portion of the market to lease aircraft from Hong Kong, the drafting of the legislation raises concerns that the policy objectives underlying the bill would not be met, that the bill is unnecessarily narrow and that it would not provide sufficient certainty to lessors.

In recent years, Hong Kong has attempted to implement a number of policy measures that aim to improve the Hong Kong economy and make Hong Kong's tax system competitive with that of Singapore. However, each time, those policy measures have been hampered in their implementation by overly restrictive, uncertain and unnecessarily complicated tax legislation. Unfortunately, the aircraft leasing bill appears to be no different, and while it hopefully will achieve its objectives, there are concerns that this incentive will suffer the same fate as others implemented in the past few years.

Tax Analysis is published for the clients and professionals of the Hong Kong and Chinese Mainland offices of Deloitte China. The contents are of a general nature only. Readers are advised to consult their tax advisors before acting on any information contained in this newsletter. For more information or advice on the above subject or analysis of other tax issues, please contact:

Beijing

Andrew Zhu

Partner
Tel: +86 10 8520 7508
Fax: +86 10 8518 1326
Email: andzhu@deloitte.com.cn

Chengdu

Frank Tang / Tony Zhang

Partner
Tel: +86 28 6789 8188
Fax: +86 28 6500 5161
Email: ftang@deloitte.com.cn
tonzhang@deloitte.com.cn

Chongqing

Frank Tang / Tony Zhang

Partner
Tel: +86 23 8823 1208 / 1216
Fax: +86 23 8859 9188
Email: ftang@deloitte.com.cn
tonzhang@deloitte.com.cn

Dalian

Bill Bai

Partner
Tel: +86 411 8371 2816
Fax: +86 411 8360 3297
Email: bilbai@deloitte.com.cn

Guangzhou

Victor Li

Partner
Tel: +86 20 8396 9228
Fax: +86 20 3888 0121
Email: vicli@deloitte.com.cn

Hangzhou

Qiang Lu / Fei He

Partner / Director
Tel: +86 571 2811 1901
Fax: +86 571 2811 1904
Email: qilu@deloitte.com.cn
fhe@deloitte.com.cn

Harbin

Jihou Xu

Partner
Tel: +86 451 8586 0060
Fax: +86 451 8586 0056
Email: jihxu@deloitte.com.cn

Hong Kong

Sarah Chin

Partner
Tel: +852 2852 6440
Fax: +852 2520 6205
Email: sachin@deloitte.com.hk

Jinan

Beth Jiang

Partner
Tel: +852 531 8518 1058
Fax: +852 531 8518 1068
Email: betjiang@deloitte.com.cn

Macau

Raymond Tang

Partner
Tel: +853 2871 2998
Fax: +853 2871 3033
Email: raytang@deloitte.com.hk

Nanjing

Frank Xu / Rosemary Hu

Partner
Tel: +86 25 5791 5208 / 6129
Fax: +86 25 8691 8776
Email: frakxu@deloitte.com.cn
roshu@deloitte.com.cn

Shanghai

Eunice Kuo

Partner
Tel: +86 21 6141 1308
Fax: +86 21 6335 0003
Email: eunicekuo@deloitte.com.cn

Shenzhen

Victor Li

Partner
Tel: +86 755 3353 8113
Fax: +86 755 8246 3222
Email: vicli@deloitte.com.cn

Suzhou

Maria Liang / Kelly Guan

Partner
Tel: +86 512 6289 1328 / 1297
Fax: +86 512 6762 3338
Email: mliang@deloitte.com.cn
kguan@deloitte.com.cn

Tianjin

Jason Su

Partner
Tel: +86 22 2320 6680
Fax: +86 22 2320 6699
Email: jassu@deloitte.com.cn

Wuhan

Justin Zhu / Gary Zhong

Partner
Tel: +86 27 8526 6618
Fax: +86 27 6885 0745
Email: juszhu@deloitte.com.cn
gzhong@deloitte.com.cn

Xiamen

Jim Chung / Charles Wu

Partner / Director
Tel: +86 592 2107 298 / 055
Fax: +86 592 2107 259
Email: jichung@deloitte.com.cn
chwu@deloitte.com.cn

About the Deloitte China National Tax Technical Centre

The Deloitte China National Tax Technical Centre ("NTC") was established in 2006 to continuously improve the quality of Deloitte China's tax services, to better serve the clients, and to help Deloitte China's tax team excel. The Deloitte China NTC prepares and publishes "Tax Analysis", "Tax News", etc. These publications include introduction and commentaries on newly issued tax legislations, regulations and circulars from technical perspectives. The Deloitte China NTC also conducts research studies and analysis and provides professional opinions on ambiguous and complex issues. For more information, please contact:

National Tax Technical Centre

Email: ntc@deloitte.com.cn

National Leader

Ryan Chang

Partner
Tel: +852 2852 6768
Fax: +852 2851 8005
Email: ryanchang@deloitte.com

Southern China (Hong Kong)

Davy Yun

Partner
Tel: +852 2852 6538
Fax: +852 2520 6205
Email: dyun@deloitte.com.hk

Northern China

Julie Zhang

Partner
Tel: +86 10 8520 7511
Fax: +86 10 8518 1326
Email: juliezhang@deloitte.com.cn

Southern China (Mainland/Macau)

German Cheung

Director
Tel: +86 20 2831 1369
Fax: +86 20 3888 0121
Email: gercheung@deloitte.com.cn

Eastern China

Kevin Zhu

Director
Tel: +86 21 6141 1262
Fax: +86 21 6335 0003
Email: kzhu@deloitte.com.cn

Western China

Tony Zhang

Partner
Tel: +86 23 8823 1216
Fax: +86 23 8859 9188
Email: tonzhang@deloitte.com.cn

If you prefer to receive future issues by soft copy or update us with your new correspondence details, please notify Wendy Luk by either email at wanluk@deloitte.com.hk or by fax to +852 2541 1911.

About Deloitte Global

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"), its network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL (also referred to as "Deloitte Global") does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about for a more detailed description of DTTL and its member firms.

Deloitte provides audit, consulting, financial advisory, risk management, tax and related services to public and private clients spanning multiple industries. Deloitte serves four out of five Fortune Global 500® companies through a globally connected network of member firms in more than 150 countries bringing world-class capabilities, insights, and high-quality service to address clients' most complex business challenges. To learn more about how Deloitte's approximately 225,000 professionals make an impact that matters, please connect with us on Facebook, LinkedIn, or Twitter.

About Deloitte in Greater China

We are one of the leading professional services providers with 24 offices in Beijing, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Taipei, Changsha, Chengdu, Chongqing, Dalian, Guangzhou, Hangzhou, Harbin, Hefei, Hsinchu, Jinan, Kaohsiung, Macau, Nanjing, Shenzhen, Suzhou, Taichung, Tainan, Tianjin, Wuhan and Xiamen in Greater China. We have nearly 13,500 people working on a collaborative basis to serve clients, subject to local applicable laws.

About Deloitte China

The Deloitte brand first came to China in 1917 when a Deloitte office was opened in Shanghai. Now the Deloitte China network of firms, backed by the global Deloitte network, deliver a full range of audit, tax, consulting and financial advisory services to local, multinational and growth enterprise clients in China. We have considerable experience in China and have been a significant contributor to the development of China's accounting standards, taxation system and local professional accountants. To learn more about how Deloitte makes an impact that matters in the China marketplace, please connect with our Deloitte China social media platforms via www2.deloitte.com/cn/en/social-media.

This communication contains general information only, and none of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, its member firms, or their related entities (collectively the "Deloitte Network") is by means of this communication, rendering professional advice or services. None of the Deloitte Network shall be responsible for any loss whatsoever sustained by any person who relies on this communication.